e-ISSN : 2620 3502
p-ISSN : 2615 3785

Semantic labeling of language units

Akhmedova Dildora Bahodirovna[1]
[1]*A Doctorate Student of Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan*

Email: axmedova_d@umail.uz

ABSTRACT

The nature of the semantic volume of the word, language corpus and creating Uzbek language corpus is under the analysis of this article. This issue of principle importance for semasiological research has been interpreted in different ways in linguistics.

Key words: Word semantics, semema, semantic labeling, language units, semasiological research, semantic size, corpus linguistics, language corpus, phenomenon.

1. INTRODUCTION

Word semantics. According to I.Kuchkortoyev, one of the issues with the word is the nature of the semantic volume of the word. This issue of principle importance for semasiological research has been interpreted in different ways in linguistics. There is a need to address these interpretations and views when establishing the language corpus, and when touching units. It is recognized by all linguists that the semantic size of a word (the meaning of the word, the meaning of the word) is not a whole, whole phenomenon. The fact that the elements of the semantics of the word are not the same phenomenon is beyond doubt. The issue that has aroused heated debate among linguists is the relationship between the elements of the word semantics: are the elements of the word semantics different, or should they be considered as different variants or variants of the same meaning? What should be the solution to the semantic tagging of words in the language corpus? In the following, we will find a solution to this problem in semasiology and find an answer for how to express it in the language corpus.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are several studies in corpus linguistics about the theory of semantic tension, the development of semantic labels. Yu D. Apresyan, I.M. Boguslavsky, B. L. Iomdin; E. V. Biryalstsev, A.M. Elizarov, N.G. Jiltsov, V. V. Ivanov., O. A. Nevzorova, V.D. Solovev; I.S. Kononenko, E.A. Sidorova; E.I. Yakovchuk, E. V. Rachelina, G.I. Kustova, O. N. Lyashevskaya, T. I. Reznikova, O.Yu. Shemanaeva, A.A. Kretov's research may be included in this work. Developing principles for creating a set of semantic tags for each language's corpus follows the peculiarities of that language. Therefore, studies on semantics and semasiology of the Uzbek language serve as a theoretical basis for the creation of a set of semantic tags in the Uzbek language, as well as the development of the principles of semantic tagging of words. It is well known that in computer linguistics lemma is considered as a sequence of symbols, that is, the arrangement of characters in a particular order means something. In order for artificial intelligence to "understand" what it means from a particular sequence of characters, each lemma must be clearly identified. According to I. Kukkortoev B. N. Golovin, F. Fortunatov, L. I. Barannikova, A. A. Potebnya "The word is the smallest meaning of the language, and it has the ability to recover freely in speech to form a sentence"; "The word is the most important unit of the language, because all the basic elements of the language structure come together"; "Words that speak of meaning apart from the meanings in the language are called words." Word is the unity of meaning with sounds"; "The word is one of the most complex linguistic phenomena that hold a separate, central place among the language units (morpheme, phraseological unit)" According to I. Kuchkortoev, the description does not fully describe the features that allow the word to be distinguished from non-word (morpheme, vocabulary, sentence, etc.).

3. ANALYSIS

The difficulty of describing the concept of a word perfectly, consistently, and consistently, has forced some scholars to reconsider it. For example, in the works of A. Maye, there are four different definitions of the word. One of these definitions (chronologically the third) is popular among linguists in the name of Maye's famous formula; It is included in the dictionary of J. Maruzo linguistic terms. This definition is as follows: "The

e-ISSN : 2620 3502
p-ISSN : 2615 3785

association of a particular set of sounds with a certain meaning is a word that allows a certain grammatical application." It is easy to see that this description is the most accurate of all of the above. Nevertheless, there are serious shortcomings in this definition of the word. First of all, it should be noted that this definition does not have a criterion for distinguishing polynemia and polysemia: each of the terms polysemantic means is a separate word. Second, there is a lack of clarity and consistency in the private label that should limit the word to the gender definition (common sense) described in the definition. In the definition of A. Maye, gender refers to the association of a particular meaning with a particular sound complex. Other linguists describe the concept of a word as a unit of meaning with a complex of sounds. G. Glison's "Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics" focuses on three components of language: 1) expression structure, 2) content structure, and 3) a dictionary. If the unit of expression structure is a morpheme, then the unity of the content structure is a semema. This classification of G. Glison is particularly useful for corpus linguistics in the semantic tapping of lemmas. If the language is based on its expression structure for morphological tagging in the corpus, then the semantic tapping must be fully contextualized. If the content structure is not fully embedded, such a corpus will not be able to fully reflect the richness of the language because it does not cover all the meanings of the word. The dictionary forms the semantic base of the language corpus. According to a group of scholars, the phoneme, which is a unity of language, is realized in a particular tone (variant) in speech, and the word meaning (common sense) is realized as a private phenomenon. Such an issue requires a distinction between two phenomena: common sense (1) and variants of private meaning (2). Such an understanding of the meaning of the word denies polysemy. According to this view, terms such as basic meaning, literal meaning, portable meaning do not represent real events; the word does not have such meanings. The word "cannot have many meanings" – writes A. Zvetsintsev, "In a word sense, the results of a particular generalization will be strengthened, and unless this generalization process stops during the whole life and development of the language, it may not be possible in parallel to integrate in several ways." Therefore, more than one word does not appear in the word, because according to A. Zvetsintsev, in order to form polysemy, the generalization of more than one line of words must be parallel. "The meaning of the word may consist of a number of potentially typical combinations," wrote Zvegintsev, while these potential typical combinations describe the unique meaning of the word in different ways." Scientists say that although the concept of lexical meaning is now widely accepted by most semasiologists, the nature and meaning of the content are still controversial in their relationship to each other.

4. DISCUSSION

Some linguists interpret lexical meaning as a simple set of differential semantic signs. According to this view, the components in the lexical meaning are mutually equal and differ from one meaning to the character and number of semantic characters. In this respect, T. P. Lomtev's observations can be noted. One of his articles analyzed the compositional meaning of words meaning individuals who differ in intellectual ability. T. P. Lomtev writes that the meaning of such words (in general, of all words) is not fully disclosed in existing dictionaries. For example, the meaning of the word wise is explained in dictionaries as a wise person, while the meaning of the word intelligible is quickly understood. T. P. Lomtev considers these descriptions inadequate and interprets the meanings of these words as follows: wise - 1) person, 2) capable of reasoning, 3) rich in intuition, 4) quick-minded, 5) read much; intelligent - 1) person, 2) capable of thinking, 3) intuition, 4) normal, understanding. The question we are interested in here is how the meaning of the words of wisdom and understanding in the above interpretation is expressed. It is understood from the above interpretation that the word "wise" has five components, and the meaning of the word "intelligence" is four components. Some of these components are common to both words: 1) person, 2) ability to reason. A number of components are of special character: 1) rich intuition, 2) quick-minded, 3) well-read (these components belong to the wise word); 1) the owner of the intuition; 2) the normal interpreter (these components refer to the intelligent word). Such a grouping of components of lexical meaning is caused by their different positions within the meaning. It is understood that semantic components in lexical meaning are not mutually equal elements, but are subordinate elements that explain each other.

5. CONCLUSION

A semantic marker is a component of the meaning of the unit unit meaning that a particular language is a regulatory feature for a particular language dictionary. This component represents the systematic relationship between the given unit of the dictionary and the other unit units with the same component. In other words, a semantic marker is the basis for combining more than one sememe into a lexical - semantic group. Semantic

e-ISSN : 2620 3502
p-ISSN : 2615 3785

differentiation is a component that is specific to a particular meaning and serves to distinguish it from other meanings. Semantic markers and semantic differential cores are a very important parameter in the semantic labeling of units. In the following sections, we will analyze the semantic tagging algorithm based on these components. The statements about lexical meaning (semema) structure allow us to draw the following conclusions. 1. Semema (lexical meaning) is not a holistic phenomenon that is not broken down into parts. Semema consists of a specific structure of ideal elements (mental components). Two different elements of the semema structure (lexical meaning) are interrelated: semantic (lexical - semantic) and valence (structural - syntagmatic component). According to their role in the structure of the semema, components are divided into three types: general (combining), differential (differentiating), and complementary components. Semema valence is expressed in two ways: the syntactic real valence and the syntactic valence.

REFERENCES

1. Менглиев Б. Лисоний тизим яхлитлиги ва унда сатҳлараро муносабатлар. Филология фанлари доктори диссертацияси. – Бухоро, 2001.
2. Саидова Ҳ.А. Ўзбек тилида ҳайвон номларининг шахс тавсифи вазифасида қўлланилиши. Филол. фанлари номз. дисс. ... автореф. - Самарқанд, 1995. - 23 б.
3. Неъматова Г. Ўзбек тилида ўсимлик номлари лексемалари: тизими ва бадиий қўлланилиши. Филол. фанлари номз. ... дисс. автореф. - Т. 1998. - 21 б.
4. Қиличев Б. Ўзбек тилида партонимия. Филол. фанлари номз. ... дисс. автореф. - Т. 1997. - 20 б.
5. Миртожиев М. Ўзбек тилида полисемия. -Т.: Фан, 1975. -140 б.; Неъматова Г. Ўзбек тилида ўсимлик номлари лексемалари: тизими ва бадиий қўлланилиши. Филол. фанлари номз. ... дисс. автореф. - Т. 1998. - 21 б.
6. Рустамов А. Сўз хусусида сўз. – Тошкент: Узбекистон ЛКСМ Марказий «Ёш гвардия» нашриёти, 1987.
7. Реформатский А. А. Введение в языковедение, М., 1967, стр. 76.
8. Левицкий В.В. Экспериментальные данные к проблеме смысловой структуры слова / «Семантическая структура слова». – М., 1971, стр. 155-158.
9. Ассоциатив-тематик майдон ҳақида қаранг: Шмелев Д.Н. Проблемы семантического анализа лексики. – М., 1973, стр. 194.
10. Карцевский С.О. Об асимметричном дуализме лингвистического знака // Звегинцев В.А. История языкознания XIX–XX вв. в очерках и извлечениях. 3-е изд. Ч. 2. М., 1965. С.85-93.
11. Аликулов Т. Полисемия существительных в узбекском языке. АКД. – Ташкент, 1966, стр. 7.
12. Миртожиев М. Ўзбек тилида полисемия. – Тошкент, 1975. – 135-бет.
13. Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика: Синонимические средства языка. М., 1974.